

Americans need mortgage deductions. I know, however, that that is one that is under discussion.

But why did our friends writing this budget not list the deductions that they would be willing to put on the table? Some of us realize that mortgage deductions help young families. It helps single women. It helps women who are maintaining or getting their first house. So here we have a special emphasis.

I'm glad my colleague mentioned breast cancer. I have introduced legislation on triple negative. It happens to have a far-reaching impact on women from all ethnic groups, whether they are Caucasian, whether they are Hispanic, or whether they are African American or Asian, but it is a deadly form of the disease, a more deadly form of the disease. And so that kind of research which many of us are arguing for is now limited because of this budget.

The budget does not—well, let me just say this. The budget takes for its own what was accomplished with the savings in the Affordable Care Act. It takes for its own the cuts that we made, were willing to make in 2012, over a trillion in cuts and spending. And it totally ignores economists who have indicated that the austerity format that was taken in Europe was the completely wrong direction, and that, then, impacts our families more negatively.

□ 1850

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I would be happy to yield.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I want to point out and make sure that our colleagues and the listening public know that the Ryan plan assumes the \$85 billion in sequester cuts. So these cuts are on top of that. And according to the bipartisan Congressional Budget Office, the sequester could cause the U.S. economy to lose 750,000 jobs. And the Ryan plan compounds these job losses.

The Economic Policy Institute has initial estimates that the House Republican budget would cost 2 million jobs in 2014 alone, relative to current policy. So why in the world would we want to take these steps that are going to result in job loss?

I yield back to the lady.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlelady for that astute assessment. When I give these various points, women are disproportionately placed. Many of them are heads of households, many of them are senior women. Many are going back into the workforce because they have resource shortages, if you will. And the Ryan budget takes in all of these; i.e., the \$85 billion in sequester cuts. By the way, again, I introduced legislation to eliminate the sequester provision out of the Budget Reconciliation Act. I happen to think that it is meritorious because we need

to start from a fair point of view, not what I call nickel and diming, ending people's research, closing doors in the Capitol, and a number of other things that are not good for America.

But let me just finish on this. If we're interested in R&D, as we indicated, or clean energy—slashed. Obviously, it will have an impact on the quality of life of families who are raising their children. What about nutrition assistance, the SNAP program? What an obliterating cut to the SNAP program, which is now serving 48 million people. Let me remind my colleagues that these are military persons, women who are in the military. These are young families. These are individuals who are in school. And so women are disproportionately impacted.

And this, I think, is clearly one of the largest conflicts of reason, and that is to underfund or take away the funding for the Affordable Care Act, which has been reaffirmed by the United States Supreme Court and has been documented as having a health care savings and providing for a healthier America. And here we are taking away coverage from 27 million Americans.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. They take away the good aspects of it, all the preventive and the health care. They propose to eliminate that, but then they keep the tax savings from it to balance their budget. It is a hoax. It's not realistic. It's not true. And I really appreciate your words here today on the floor.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. They take all the good things that, might I say, the Democrats have worked on and can really be defined as balanced and fair and utilize it in a budget that is absolutely lopsided. And I thank you for having us on the floor to explain to the women of America why this budget will not be good for them, their children, or their expanded families, and that we're committed to standing against this kind of approach that is really not the American way.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentlelady.

In conclusion, Americans can't afford more fuzzy math and budget gimmicks. We need real solutions that help grow our economy, create jobs, support the health and economic security of our seniors, and one that will address the arbitrary sequester cuts. Chairman RYAN's budget fails to address any of these.

Our Republican friends like to talk about making the hard choices. What they propose here would indeed make things much harder for millions of Americans, but it will also make things much easier for a fortunate few. That's their plan. The reality is that the majority's Ryan budget harms those who need help and doles out tax breaks and benefits to those who do not. So let me be as clear as I possibly can: the Ryan budget, if it were passed by the House, would risk our recovery.

I want to thank all the participants tonight. I thank the like-minded men

who came to the floor to support us and the women that have spoken out tonight on how the budget affects women, children, and their expanded families.

I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 803, SUPPORTING KNOWLEDGE AND INVESTING IN LIFE-LONG SKILLS ACT

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-16) on the resolution (H. Res. 113) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 803) to reform and strengthen the workforce investment system of the Nation to put Americans back to work and make the United States more competitive in the 21st century, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

FIREARMS TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise to call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join with us and pass the bipartisan legislation to strengthen Federal penalties for straw purchasing of firearms. I'm a hunter and a gun owner, and I believe strongly in the Second Amendment. I support law-abiding Americans' right to own firearms, and nothing in this legislation infringes upon that right. This bill simply helps keep guns out of the hands of dangerous criminals who cannot legally buy guns on their own.

I chair the House Gun Violence Prevention Task Force. Our task force has developed a comprehensive set of policy principles that will help reduce gun violence. To develop these principles, we met with virtually everyone who had an interest on this issue: Republicans, Democrats, the NRA, gun owners and gun safety groups, mental health experts, educational leaders, people from the video game and movie industries, hunting and sportsman's groups, law enforcement leaders, and the Vice President of the United States. Out of these meetings, one of the principles we developed dealt specifically with strengthening penalties